

## APPENDIX A.

### REPORT ON BOUNDARIES OF TERRITORIAL ACQUISITIONS.

[Reprinted from Census Bulletin No. 74, published July 20, 1901.]

Hon. WILLIAM R. MERRIAM,  
*Director of the Census.*

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith, for publication as a census bulletin, the "Report of a Conference upon the Boundaries of the Successive Acquisitions of Territory by the United States." The conference was constituted of representatives of the Department of State, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Geological Survey, the Census Office, and the Library of Congress. It was appointed at the request of the Census Office, and as an advisory committee to that office on certain controverted subjects.

In the "Statistical Atlas of the United States, Based upon Results of the Eleventh Census," is a map (plate I) giving the boundaries of the successive acquisitions of territory by the United States, exclusive of Alaska. The Twelfth Census will probably publish a similar map. Another Government office issues a map giving the same information. In nearly all essentials the two agree, but, naturally, in certain minor points, differences between them may be found. Some of the differences relate to a matter—namely, the true boundary of the Louisiana Purchase—which is of timely interest, now that the centennial anniversary of that purchase is approaching.

Thinking that in such a matter even minor discrepancies between coordinate branches of the Government should, if possible, be harmonized, and seeking the friendly criticism of disinterested experts upon the conclusions of the Census Office, the Acting Director addressed identical letters to the Secretary of State, the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Director of the Geological Survey, and the Commissioner of the Land Office, asking each to appoint a representative. The representatives appointed held five meetings, and on every point voted upon, with one exception, reached unanimous conclusions. These conclusions in some cases sustained the position of the Census Office, in some cases sustained the position of the Land Office, and in some cases departed from both. It should be carefully observed that the conference was

simply one to advise the Census Office, and that its findings have no official standing, but are entitled only to such weight as is carried by the names of the individuals signing the report. Even so, there is no doubt that its results have materially decreased the conflicts of official authority in this field. The main conclusions of the conference, as detailed in the following pages, may be summarized as follows:

1. The region between the Mississippi River and lakes Maurepas and Pontchartrain to the west, and the Perdido River to the east, should not be assigned either to the Louisiana Purchase or to the Florida Purchase, but marked with a legend indicating that title to it between 1803 and 1819 was in dispute.

2. The line between the Mississippi River and the Lake of the Woods, separating the territory of the United States prior to 1803 from the Louisiana Purchase, should be drawn from the most northwestern point of the Lake of the Woods to the nearest point on the Mississippi River, in Lake Bemidji.

3. The western boundary of the Louisiana Purchase between 49° and 42° north followed the watershed of the Rocky Mountains; thence it ran east along the parallel of 42° north to a point due north of the source of the Arkansas River, and thence south to that source.

4. The northwestern boundary of Texas as annexed extended up the principal stream of the Rio Grande to its source and thence due north to the parallel of 42° north.

5. The southern boundary of the Mexican Cession of 1848 should be drawn from a point on the Rio Grande eight miles north of Paso, instead of from one about thirty miles farther north, as is the usual practice at present, west three degrees, and thence north to the first branch of the Gila River.

The cordial thanks of the Census Office are due to the other branches of the Government service which have aided our work generously and without stint.

Yours, respectfully,

WALTER F. WILLCOX,  
*Chief Statistician for Methods and Results.*

**REPORT OF A CONFERENCE UPON THE BOUNDARIES OF THE SUCCESSIVE ACQUISITIONS OF TERRITORY BY THE UNITED STATES, NOVEMBER, 1899, TO JANUARY, 1900.**

The undersigned representatives of the Department of State, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Geological Survey, the Census Office, and the Library of Congress, constituting a conference upon the boundaries of the successive acquisitions of territory by the United States, so far as discrepancies respecting them have been found to exist, and called together by a circular letter of the Acting Director of the Census, dated November 16, 1899, beg leave to report as follows:

On November 20, 1899, the conference held its first meeting in the Pavilion of the Seals, Library of Congress, that room having been kindly provided for the purpose by the Librarian of Congress. There were present, Mr. Andrew H. Allen, representing the Department of State; Mr. O. H. Tittmann, representing the Coast and Geodetic Survey; Mr. Harry King, from the General Land Office; Mr. Henry Gannett, representing the Geological Survey; and Mr. Walter F. Willcox, representing the Census Office. Mr. P. Lee Phillips, chief of the division of maps and charts in the Library of Congress, also attended the meeting to render such assistance as might be desired in the way of advice touching maps, etc., and their accessibility. Mr. King, of the General Land Office, announced that he attended merely as an auditor, without the intention of participating in the action of the conference, but with the purpose of reporting the contemplated scope of its work to the Commissioner of the General Land Office. The conference then proceeded to organize by the election of Mr. Willcox as chairman and Mr. Allen as secretary. Mr. Phillips was invited by the conference to take part in its business as a member, and very kindly consented to do so.

The territorial acquisitions, concerning the boundaries of which discrepancies had been noted, were taken up in chronological order. The subject of the

**LOUISIANA PURCHASE**

was thus first considered, and the situation discovered was, briefly, that the territory came into the possession of the United States through the treaty of 1803 with France, having the same extent as when ceded by France to Spain in 1763, and as when retroceded to France by Spain by the treaty of San Ildefonso, of October 1, 1800. To ascertain the extent of this territory eastward, the conference examined the several well-known authorities upon the early history of Louisiana—Marbois, Ellicott, Gayarré, Darby, Stoddard, and others; the treaties involved; letters of Monroe, Jefferson, and Talleyrand; certain maps; the text of the grant to Crozat by Louis XIV, in 1712; the presentation of the case by the Commissioner of the General Land Office in his volume entitled "The Louisiana Purchase;" etc.

This examination failed, however, to enable the conference to determine the dispute about the territory between the Mississippi and Perdido rivers, claimed alike by Spain and France, and afterwards by the United States, and finally released by Spain in the treaty of 1819, in language assigning no limits to West Florida. The conference concluded that the boundary line of this territory at the Mississippi River, as claimed by Spain, should be so defined by a legend on the map, and that the boundary line at the Perdido River, as claimed by the United States, should be similarly indicated. This conclusion was reached with an understanding or admission of the following facts touching the territory between the two rivers claimed by Spain as a part of West Florida: That the territory of Louisiana, as described by France and granted to Crozat by Louis XIV, extended on the east to the river Mobile, which, with the port, was ceded specifically by France to England by the treaty of Paris in 1763, Spain at the same time ceding the Floridas to Great Britain, with St. Augustine and the bay of Pensacola—thus, inferentially at least, determining the respective boundaries of Louisiana and West Florida; that the first occupation of the interior of the territory between the rivers Mississippi and Perdido by the Spaniards, was during the war of the American Revolution, when it belonged to Great Britain; that Great Britain retroceded the Floridas to Spain in 1783, at which time the Louisiana territory belonged to Spain by the French cession in the preliminaries of peace of 1762 (confirmed in 1763), whereby "all the country known under the name of Louisiana" was transferred; that Spain in 1800 retroceded Louisiana to France as it was received from France in 1763; that France in 1803 ceded the territory of Louisiana to the United States, as discovered and held by France, ceded to Spain, and retroceded to France; and, finally, that in 1819 Spain ceded to the United States all the territory held or claimed by His Catholic Majesty under the names of East and West Florida. In addition to the grounds of dispute between France and Spain, and the United States and Spain, here shown, there was a conflicting claim concerning the extent of West Florida, born of the contention between French and Spanish discoverers and settlers in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; and there was also the claim of the French, by right of La Salle's descent of the Mississippi in 1682, to "all the country drained by that river."

With reference to the Louisiana boundary, there remained but one point of difference between the maps under consideration. Article II of the definitive treaty of peace of 1783, between the United States and Great Britain, after defining the northern boundary to the Lake of the Woods, continues as follows: " \* \* \* Thence through the said lake to the most northwestern point thereof, and from thence on a due west course to the river Mississippi." Such a line as that described being obviously impossible, the Mississippi River being south not west of the Lake of the Woods, the line drawn

by the conference was a line from the most northwestern point of that lake to the nearest point on the Mississippi. This line the conference regarded as justified by rules of international law and practice respecting vaguely described boundaries in such topographical circumstances.

#### THE OREGON TERRITORY

was the next subject to receive the attention of the conference. There seemed to be nothing in the history of that part of our possessions to warrant mention of the claim of Spain rather than that of Great Britain, and the final settlement of the question of sovereignty and boundaries by the treaty of 1846, fixing the forty-ninth parallel, "by an amicable compromise," as the northern boundary west of the Rocky Mountains, seemed to be a recognition by the United States of the importance of the British pretensions sufficient to warrant mention on the map. The treaty of 1819 (the Florida Cession) had already served as a conclusive relinquishment by Spain of any claim in this quarter. Therefore the conference, considering these facts together with the historical narrative of discoveries and occupations on the northwest coast of America by both Spanish and British explorers and adventurers, and the part played by traders, explorers, and settlers from the United States within the territory known under the name of Oregon in the eighteenth century, determined to place as a legend on the face of the map, to describe briefly and with historical accuracy the area in question, the following words: Oregon territory discovered and settled; British claim extinguished, 1846.

#### TEXAS

was next in order for discussion and determination, and the conference decided, almost without debate, that the northwestern boundary of that territory as admitted to statehood in the Union, should be that defined on the map of the General Land Office—the line there shown coinciding closely with the line on the Disturnell "Map of the United Mexican States," 1847, filed with the treaty of 1848 as a part of that convention.

#### THE FIRST MEXICAN CESSION.

The southern boundary of the United States west of the Rio Grande, 1848, was determined in the same manner but with a different result, the line adopted being that indicated on the Disturnell map, according to the conference's interpretation of that chart. The facts are adequately stated by Major Emory on page 16 of his Report on the United States and Mexican Boundary Survey, vol. 1, as follows:

"It is proper for me, however, before closing this chapter, to refer to a publication issued by Mr. J. R. Bartlett, one of the late commissioners on the part of the United States, which professes to give an accurate account of the affairs of the commission. It is not my purpose to review that work, and expose its errors, but simply to correct some statements affecting myself.

"Mr. Bartlett's principal achievement on the boundary was the agreement with General Conde, the Mexican Commissioner, fixing the initial point on the Rio Bravo [i. e., Rio Grande], in the parallel of 32° 22', instead of a point as laid down on the treaty map,

about eight miles above El Paso, which would have brought it to the parallel of 31° 52'. That agreement is no less remarkable than the adroitness and success with which Mr. Bartlett convinced the authorities at Washington of its correctness.

"The question has been so thoroughly discussed that a reproduction of it is not called for. It is sufficient to say here that it was disapproved by the astronomer and surveyor on the commission at the time, and was finally repudiated by the Government.

"\* \* \* My signature as surveyor was only required, as alleged, to perfect the *official documents*; the words of the order were, 'You will sign the map of the initial point agreed upon by the two commissioners.'

"By reference to the treaty it will be seen that any agreement of the kind required the action of the joint commission, and that the joint commission was to be composed, not only of the two commissioners, but of the two surveyors also.

"I refused to recognize the act as that of the joint commission, and signed the map as the order directed, carefully and studiously attaching a certificate that it was the initial point of the two *commissioners*; and to prevent the possibility of misconception, an agreement in writing was entered into with Mr. Salazar, and our signatures attested by witnesses, showing that the map was only that of the boundary agreed upon by the two commissioners, and nothing else.

"This course, while it permitted me to obey a specific order in writing from a superior, left the Government free to act, and repudiate the agreement by the two commissioners, as it subsequently did."

As the line on the Disturnell map delimiting the southern boundary of the United States under the treaty of 1848 is identical with the northern boundary of the territory purchased in 1853, the conference next arrived at the point of considering

#### THE GADSDEN PURCHASE.

An examination of the treaties, of the report of Maj. W. H. Emory, already referred to and quoted, and other evidence, together with a study of the treaty map, developed the fact that the repudiated line agreed to by one of the United States commissioners, Mr. J. R. Bartlett, and the Mexican Commissioner, General Conde, seems to have been adopted by the General Land Office, though after having been run only one and one-half degrees west from the point of beginning, about thirty-eight miles north of Paso, the survey was abandoned and the line repudiated by the Government of the United States. The line indicated by the treaty or Disturnell map begins at a point about eight miles north of Paso or El Paso, runs west three degrees on a parallel, and thence north on a meridian to the first branch of the Gila River. This line was adopted by the conference as the eastern part of the northern boundary of the Gadsden Purchase. The conclusion was reached after consideration of Mr. Bartlett's claims, Major Emory's report, the action of the Government, and the treaty map.

A map indicating the boundary lines discussed and the conclusions reached respecting them is submitted by the conference.

WALTER F. WILLCOX, *Chairman*.

ANDREW H. ALLEN, *Secretary*.

O. H. TITTMANN.

HENRY GANNETT.

P. LEE PHILLIPS.

WASHINGTON, April 5, 1900.

## APPENDIX B.

### APPORTIONMENTS.

As the count of population is made primarily for the purpose of fixing the membership of the House of Representatives, under the provisions of section 2 of Article I of the Constitution, as modified by section 2 of Article XIV of the Amendments, a brief statement is herein made of all acts relating to the various apportionments, together with a table showing the total membership of the House of Representatives under each apportionment and the number of Representatives assigned to each of the states under the several acts from the formation of the government to the present time.

The membership of the House of Representatives was originally fixed at 65, under the provisions of section 2 of Article I of the Constitution.

The apportionment of Representatives in Congress, according to the enumeration of the First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Censuses, was made by Congress. At these apportionments Congress set the ratio of population for each member allowed, and also at each apportionment fixed the total number of members of the House.

The law for the taking of the Seventh Census was intended to be permanent (act of May 23, 1850, 9 Stats., 428). It presented a rule of apportionment, fixed the number of members of the House at 233, and directed the Secretary of the Interior thereafter to make the apportionment to each state.

The apportionment under the Eighth Census was made under this law, but Congress on March 4, 1862, fixed the total number of members at 241, and the Secretary of the Interior apportioned the new quotas to the states.

The ninth and tenth apportionments were made by Congress; hence it may be assumed that the power conferred on the Secretary of the Interior by the act of May 23, 1850, was repealed by implication. Heretofore all apportionments have been made at the long sessions of Congress, being the second session after each census year, but early enough for the election of Representatives to the next ensuing Congress.

The apportionments under the Eleventh and Twelfth Censuses were made at the short session of Congress immediately following the date of the census enumeration, the apportionment act under the Eleventh Census having been approved February 7, 1891, and that under the Twelfth Census, January 16, 1901.

The population of the several states and the number of Indians not taxed, as returned at the Twelfth Census, are given in table I on page xviii.

The apportionment of Representatives, based upon the enumeration at the Twelfth Census, as provided by the act of Congress approved January 16, 1901, is shown by states in the following table:

*Apportionment of Representatives under the Twelfth Census, by states.*

STATES.	Member- ship prior to appor- tionment.	Member- ship after appor- tionment.	Gain.
Total .....	357	386	29
Alabama .....	9	9	.....
Arkansas .....	6	7	1
California .....	7	8	1
Colorado .....	2	3	1
Connecticut .....	4	5	1
Delaware .....	1	1	.....
Florida .....	2	3	1
Georgia .....	11	11	.....
Idaho .....	1	1	.....
Illinois .....	22	25	3
Indiana .....	13	13	.....
Iowa .....	11	11	.....
Kansas .....	8	8	.....
Kentucky .....	11	11	.....
Louisiana .....	6	7	1
Maine .....	4	4	.....
Maryland .....	6	6	.....
Massachusetts .....	13	14	1
Michigan .....	12	12	.....
Minnesota .....	7	9	2
Mississippi .....	7	8	1
Missouri .....	15	16	1
Montana .....	1	1	.....
Nebraska .....	6	6	.....
Nevada .....	1	1	.....
New Hampshire .....	2	2	.....
New Jersey .....	8	10	2
New York .....	34	37	3
North Carolina .....	9	10	1
North Dakota .....	1	2	1
Ohio .....	21	21	.....
Oregon .....	2	2	.....
Pennsylvania .....	30	32	2
Rhode Island .....	2	2	.....
South Carolina .....	7	7	.....
South Dakota .....	2	2	.....
Tennessee .....	10	10	.....
Texas .....	13	16	3
Utah .....	1	1	.....
Vermont .....	2	2	.....
Virginia .....	10	10	.....
Washington .....	2	3	1
West Virginia .....	4	5	1
Wisconsin .....	10	11	1
Wyoming .....	1	1	.....

The following table presents concisely the facts regarding the apportionments made under the several censuses:

STATISTICS OF POPULATION.

Number of Members in the House of Representatives of Congress assigned to

STATES.	1900 Twelfth Census, apportionment by act January 16, 1901. (31 Stats., 733.)		1890 Eleventh Census, apportionment by act February 7, 1891. (26 Stats., 735.)		1880 Tenth Census, apportionment by act February 25, 1882. (22 Stats., 5.)		1870 Ninth Census, apportionment by act February 2, 1872. <sup>1</sup> (17 Stats., 28.)		1860 Eighth Census, apportionment by act May 23, 1860. <sup>2</sup> (3 Stats., 428-432.)		1850 Seventh Census, apportionment by act May 23, 1850. <sup>3</sup> (9 Stats., 428-432.)	
	Appor- tion- ment.	Assigned after ap- portion- ment.	Appor- tion- ment.	Assigned after ap- portion- ment.	Appor- tion- ment.	Assigned after ap- portion- ment.	Appor- tion- ment.	Assigned after ap- portion- ment.	Appor- tion- ment.	Assigned after ap- portion- ment.	Appor- tion- ment.	Assigned after ap- portion- ment.
1 The United States .....	386		356	1	325	7	292	1	241	2	234	3
2 Alabama .....	9		9		8		8		6		7	
3 Arkansas .....	7		6		5		4		3		2	
4 California .....	8		7		6		4		3		2	
5 Colorado .....	3		2		1			1				
6 Connecticut .....	6		4		4		4		4		4	
7 Delaware .....	1		1		1		1		1		1	
8 Florida .....	3		2		2		2		1		1	
9 Georgia .....	11		11		10		9		7		8	
10 Idaho .....	1		1			1						
11 Illinois .....	25		22		20		19		14		9	
12 Indiana .....	13		13		13		13		11		11	
13 Iowa .....	11		11		11		9		6		2	
14 Kansas .....	8		8		7		3		1			
15 Kentucky .....	11		11		11		10		9		10	
16 Louisiana .....	7		6		6		6		5		4	
17 Maine .....	4		4		4		5		5		6	
18 Maryland .....	6		6		6		6		5		6	
19 Massachusetts .....	14		13		12		11		10		11	
20 Michigan .....	12		12		11		9		6		4	
21 Minnesota .....	9		7		5		3		2			2
22 Mississippi .....	8		7		7		6		5		6	
23 Missouri .....	16		15		14		13		9		7	
24 Montana .....	1		1			1						
25 Nebraska .....	6		6		3		1			1		
26 Nevada .....	1		1		1		1			1		
27 New Hampshire .....	2		2		2		3		3		3	
28 New Jersey .....	10		8		7		7		5		5	
29 New York .....	37		34		34		33		31		33	
30 North Carolina .....	10		9		9		8		7		8	
31 North Dakota .....	2		1			1						
32 Ohio .....	21		21		21		20		19		21	
33 Oregon .....	2		2		1		1		1			1
34 Pennsylvania .....	32		30		28		27		24		25	
35 Rhode Island .....	2		2		2		2		2		2	
36 South Carolina .....	7		7		7		5		4		6	
37 South Dakota .....	2		2			2						
38 Tennessee .....	10		10		10		10		8		10	
39 Texas .....	16		13		11		6		4		2	
40 Utah .....	1			1								
41 Vermont .....	2		2		2		3		3		3	
42 Virginia .....	10		10		10		9		11		13	
43 Washington .....	3		2			1						
44 West Virginia .....	5		4		4		3					
45 Wisconsin .....	11		10		9		8		6		3	
46 Wyoming .....	1		1			1						
Date after which apportionment takes effect .....	March 3, 1903.....		March 3, 1893.....		March 3, 1883.....		March 3, 1873.....		March 3, 1863.....		March 3, 1853.....	

<sup>1</sup> Membership originally fixed at 283, but increased by act of May 30, 1872, to 292. (17 Stats., 192.)  
<sup>2</sup> Membership increased from 233 to 241 by act of March 4, 1862. (12 Stats., 353.)  
<sup>3</sup> Membership increased from 233 to 234 by supplementary act of July 30, 1852. (10 Stats., 25.)  
<sup>4</sup> Included in the 20 members originally assigned to Massachusetts, but credited to Maine after its admission as a state March 15, 1820. (3 Stats., 555.)

## ccxxix


1840 Sixth Census, apportionment by act June 25, 1842. (3 Stats., 491.)		1830 Fifth Census, apportionment by act May 22, 1832. (4 Stats., 516.)		1820 Fourth Census, apportionment by act March 7, 1822. (3 Stats., 651.)		1810 Third Census, apportionment by act December 21, 1811. (2 Stats., 669.)		1800 Second Census, apportionment by act January 14, 1802. (2 Stats., 128.)		1790 First Census, apportionment by act April 14, 1792. (1 Stats., 253.)		Previous to 1790. First apportionment, Constitution, Article 1, section 2.	
Appor- tion- ment.	Assigned after ap- portion- ment.	Appor- tion- ment.	Assigned after ap- portion- ment.	Appor- tion- ment.	Assigned after ap- portion- ment.	Appor- tion- ment.	Assigned after ap- portion- ment.	Appor- tion- ment.	Assigned after ap- portion- ment.	Appor- tion- ment.	Assigned after ap- portion- ment.	Appor- tion- ment.	Assigned after ap- portion- ment.
223	9	240	2	213	.....	181	5	141	1	105	1	65	.....
7		5		3			1						
1			1										
	2												
4		6		6		7		7		7		5	
1		1		1		2		1		1		1	
	1												
8		9		7		6		4		2		3	
7		3		1			1						
10		7		3			1						
	2												
10		13		12		10		6		2			
4		3		3			1						
7		8		7		47							
6		8		9		9		9		8		6	
10		12		13		18		17		14		8	
3			1										
4		2		1			1						
5		2		1									
4		5		6		6		5		4		3	
5		6		6		6		6		5		4	
34		40		34		27		17		10		6	
9		18		13		18		12		10		5	
21		19		14		6			1				
24		28		26		23		18		13		8	
2		2		2		2		2		2		1	
7		9		9		9		8		6		5	
11		13		9		6		3			1		
	2												
4		5		5		6		4		2			
15		21		22		23		22		19		10	






NEW PEN ILL OHI MISS TEX MAS INDIC IOWA GEO KEN WIS TEN N.C. NEW VIR ALA MIN MISS CALI KAN LOU S.C. ARK MAR NEB WES CON MAY COLO FLO WAS RHIC ORE NEV S.D. OHIO IND VEF N.D. DIST UT MO NEV DEL IDA HA AR WY AL NE


# TOTAL AND URBAN POPULATION AT EACH CENSUS. THE BLACK PORTION IS URBAN.



## DENSITY OF POPULATION AT EACH CENSUS, EXCLUDING ALASKA AND HAWAII.




## PROPORTION OF URBAN TO TOTAL POPULATION AT EACH CENSUS.







LAND AND URBAN POPULATION BY STATES AND TERRITORIES: 1900.  
THE BLACK PORTION IS URBAN.




DENSITY OF POPULATION BY STATES AND TERRITORIES: 1900.




TOTAL POPULATION OF CITIES OF MORE THAN 100,000 INHABITANTS: 1900.





TOTAL POPULATION OF EACH STATE AND TERRITORY AT EACH CENSUS.



HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS








SHOWING THE POSITION OF THE  
**CENTER OF POPULATION**  
 AT THE CLOSE OF EACH DECADE FROM  
 1790 TO 1900  
 AND THE LOCATION OF THE  
**MEDIAN POINT**

IN 1880, 1890 AND 1900


Compiled by  
 HENRY GANNETT, GEOGRAPHER.

★ Center of Population    ▲ Median Point


Scale of miles  
 10 50 100 200 300 400 500 600 700 800 900








PROPORTION OF URBAN TO TOTAL POPULATION, BY STATES AND TERRITORIES, AT EACH CENSUS.




Note: States and territories having urban population for less than three decades, are not shown.


# TOTAL POPULATION OF GREAT CITIES AT EACH CENSUS.








FOREIGN BORN POPULATION, BY STATES AND TERRITORIES: 1900.




NEGRO POPULATION, BY STATES AND TERRITORIES: 1900.



Note: States and territories having a negro population of less than 1000 are not shown.




CONSTITUENTS OF THE POPULATION OF STATES AND TERRITORIES: 1900.



Native white of native parents   Native white of foreign parents   Foreign white  
Indians   Chinese and Japanese   Negro


THE CONSTITUENTS OF THE POPULATION OF CITIES OF  
MORE THAN 100,000 INHABITANTS: 1900.




Native white of native parents   Native white of foreign parents   Foreign white  
Chinese and Japanese   Negro.



COMPOSITION OF THE POPULATION OF STATES AND TERRITORIES  
INCLUDING RESIDENT NATIVES, NATIVE IMMIGRANTS AND FOREIGN  
BORN, WITH PER CENT OF NATIVE EMIGRANTS: 1900.




FOREIGN BORN OF EACH LEADING NATIONALITY AT EACH CENSUS: 1850 TO 1900.



\* Does not include Hawaii

# WHITE POPULATION OF FOREIGN PARENTAGE, INCLUDING FOREIGN BORN WHITES, BY STATES AND TERRITORIES: 1900.



## PROPORTION OF ALIENS TO TOTAL FOREIGN BORN MALES OF VOTING AGE IN EACH SPECIFIED NATIVITY: 1900.

